arXiv:1612.00703v1 [q-bio.NC] 26 Nov 2016

EEG-assisted Modulation of Sound Sources in the Auditory Scene

Marzieh Haghighi[1], **Mohammad Moghadamfalahi**[1], **Murat Akcakaya**[2] **& Deniz Erdogmus**[1]

[1] Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA 360 Huntington Ave, Boston, United States

[2] University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Ave, Pittsburgh, PA, US

E-mail: haghighi@ece.neu.edu

September 2016

Abstract. Noninvasive EEG (electroencephalography) based auditory attention detection could be useful for improved hearing aids in the future. This work is a preliminary attempt to investigate the feasibility of online classification of auditory attention using a noninvasive EEG-based brain interface. Proposed online system modulates the upcoming sound sources through gain adaptation which combines decisions from a classifier trained on offline calibration data. For decision making, features are extracted based on cross correlation of EEG and speech envelope at specific time lags that were shown to be useful to discriminate attention in the competing speakers scenario. Attention detection performance of the model and its application to online source modulation is reported in the form of AUCs. On average, for attended speaker classification in training session and application of learned model on online session, the presented approach yields 88% and 82% AUC values respectively, using 20 seconds of data for each decision.

Keywords: auditory BCI, cocktail party problem, auditory attention classification

1. Introduction

Approximately 35 million Americans (11.3% of the population) suffer from hearing loss; this number is increasing and is projected to reach 40 million by 2025 [1]. Within this population only 30% prefer using current generations of hearing aids that are available on the market. One of the most common complaints associated with hearing-aid use is understating speech in the presence of noise and interferences. Effects of interfering sounds and masking on speech intelligibility and audibility has been widely studied [2], [3]. Specifically, it has been shown [3] that increase in SNR needed for the same level of speech understanding given a background noise for people with hearing loss can be as high as 30 dB more comparing to people with normal hearing. Therefore, amplifying the target signal versus unwanted noises and interferences to facilitate hearing

and increase speech intelligibility and listening comfort is one of the basic concepts exploited by hearing aids [3]. Identifying the signal versus noise is a main step required for design of a hearing aid. It can be a difficult task in complicated auditory scenes like a cocktail party scenario in which signal and interferences have acoustic features of speech and can instantly switch their roles based on the attention of the listener and can not be detected based on the predefined assumptions on signal and noise features. Our brain distinguishes the sources based on their spectral profile, harmonicity, spectral or spatial separation, temporal onsets and offsets, temporal modulation, and temporal separation[4],[5] and focus on one sound to analyse the auditory scene [6] in the so called cocktail party effect [7]. Existence of each cue can reduce informational and energetic masking of competing sources and help focusing our attention on the target source.

Brain/Body Computer Interface (BBCI) systems can be used to augment the current generations of hearing aids by discriminating among attended and unattended sound sources. They can be incorporated to provide external evidence based on top-down selective attention of listeners [8]. Attempts have been made to incorporate bottom-up attention evidences in design of the hearing aids. For example, direction based hearing aids that detect attention direction from eye gaze and amplify sounds coming from that direction can be an example of bottom- up attention evidence incorporation [9]. Moreover, there are attempts to use electroencephalography (EEG)-based brain computer interfaces (BCIs) for the identification of attended sound sources. EEG has been extensively used in BCI designs due to its high temporal resolution, non-invasiveness, and portability. These characteristics, in addition to EEG devices being inexpensive and accessible, make EEG a practical choice for the design of a BCI that can be integrated into hearing aids to identify auditory attention. A crucial step in such an integration is to build an EEG-based BCI that employs auditory attention.

EEG-based BCIs that rely on external auditory stimulation have recently attracted attention from the research community. For example, auditory-evoked P300 BCI spelling system for locked-in patients is widely studied [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15]. It was shown that fundamental frequency, amplitude, pitch and direction of audio stimuli are distinctive features, which can be processed and distinguished by the brain. Also, more recent studies using EEG measurements have shown that there is a cortical entrainment to the temporal envelope of the speech [16], [17], [18]. A study on the quality of cortical entrainment to auditory stimulus envelope by top down cognitive attention has shown enhancement of obligatory auditory processing activity in top-down attention responses when competing auditory stimuli differ in space direction [19] and frequency [20].

Recently, EEG-based BCI has also been used in cocktail party problems for the classification of attended versus unattended sound sources [21], [22], [23]. In the identification of an attended sound source in a cocktail party problem, stimulus reconstruction to estimate the envelope of the input speech stream from high density EEG measurements is the state-of-the-art practice [24], [21]. In the aforementioned model, envelope of the attended stimulus is reconstructed using spatio-temporal linear

decoder applied on neural recordings. In one study that considered the identification of the attended sound source in a dichotic (different sounds playing in each ear) two speaker scenario, 60 seconds of high density EEG data recorded through 128 electrodes were used in the stimulus reconstruction. Two decoders using the attended and unattended speech were trained and it was shown that estimated sound source using the attended decoder has higher correlation with the attended speech compared to the estimated stimuli using unattended decoder with unattended speech [21]. Another study extended the approach in [21] to use almost one fourth of the high-density 96 channel EEG data in the identification of attended speaker in a scenario in which the speakers are simultaneously generating speech from different binaural directions [22]. Using 60 seconds of EEG data, they were able to replicate previous work [21] and show its robustness for having a more natural spatial speech stimuli features [22]. In a related study, authors have compared three types of features extracted from speech signal and EEG measurements to learn a linear classifier for the identification of the attended speaker using 20 seconds of data from high density 128 channels EEG recordings [23]. Moreover, A proof of concept hearing aid system that uses EEG assistance (with 60 seconds of EEG data) to decide on attended sound source by the hearing aid user was first demonstrated in [25]. In our previous related work, we have investigated the role of frequency and spatial features of audio stimuli signal in EEG activities in an auditory BCI system with the purpose of detecting the attended auditory source in a cocktail party setting. We reported high performance single channel classification of attended sound vs unattended one based on its frequency and direction using 60 seconds of EEG and stimuli data [26]. Even though these results are still far from satisfying the requirements for the EEG-based attention detector which can be incorporated in an online setting for a hearing aid application, they are motivating for further investigation in this area.

In this paper, first we show successful classification of attended speaker source in a diotic (both sounds playing in both ears) two speaker scenario using 20 seconds of EEG data recorded from 16 channels. Having high cross validation performance even for single channel classification on offline data, we introduce an online system that gives feedback on attention of the user in the form of attended to unattended source energy ratio amplification. The level of amplification of attended versus suppression of unattended source is assigned based on a probabilistic model defined over the classifier trained on the offline data including temporal dependency of the user's attention. Therefore, this paper introduces a framework that uses the probabilistic information of the user's attention to enhance the concentration of the user on the target source in multi-speaker scenarios. This framework is an initial attempt to provide design perspective for EEG-augmented hearing aid. We show that the developed system has offline identification performance compared to the state-of-the-art, we progress beyond the state-of-the-art and present the performance of an online system.

2. System Overview

The below diagram summarizes the steps of our proposed BCI system. The proposed system gets the mixture of sounds from the environment as the input and modifies the gain of each specific sound. The output of this system is the input to the ear channel.

The decision on gain modification of each sound is made by the BCI module which consists of three submodules of gain controller, auditory attention inference System and hearing aid DSP System. Hearing aid DSP System estimates independent sound sources from the mixture of sounds in the environment and outputs the information to the gain controller and attention inference module. In this work, we assume that we have the estimated sources which are the outputs of the DSP system based on blind source separation.

Auditory attention inference system estimates the probability of attention on each specific sound source using EEG measurements and estimated sound sources. Gain Controller system takes the estimated probabilities from the attention inference system to modify gains of each specific sound. The details of the attention inference system and gain adjustments are provided in the following sections.



Figure 1. EEG-augmented BCI sytem overview.

2.1. Online Gain Controller System

Lets assume that $S_n = (\mathbf{s}_{1,n}, ..., \mathbf{s}_{i,n}, ..., \mathbf{s}_{M,n})$ is a matrix containing original sources that each $\mathbf{s}_{i,n}$ is a column vector for i^{th} sound channel for n^{th} round of sending feedback. $\hat{S}_n = (\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{1,n}, ..., \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{i,n}, ..., \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{M,n})$, would be the estimated source matrix after blind source separation, which we assume exists and its design is out of the scope of this paper. $\mathbf{w_n} = (w_{1,n}, ..., w_{i,n}, ..., w_{M,n})^\intercal$ is the vector of weights with $w_{i,n}$ being a scalar showing the gain of i^{th} estimated sound source; and e_n is the EEG evidence vector for n^{th} round. $A_n = i$, indicates the attention of subject is on the i^{th} sound source. Subject will start listening to all sounds with equal energy and then based on brain interface decisions for subject attention on each sound source, speech enhancement or automatic gain controller (AGC) module will assign appropriate weights to each sound source for $n + 1^{th}$ round

of sending feedback according to the following equation:

$$\mathbf{w_{n+1}} = f(p(A_n|\varepsilon_n(\hat{S}_n, e_n)), \mathbf{w_{n-j}}) \qquad j = 1, 2, .. \tag{1}$$

This states that the weights for the upcoming sound sources ($n + 1^{th}$ round) will be decided based on probability of attention given current EEG evidence (n^{th} round) and previous weights that were used at the $n - 1^{th}$ round. The selection of optimal gain control policies (choosing the form of f) that considers other factors such as sound quality due to amplitude modulation, response time to changes versus robustness to outlier incidents influencing brain interface decisions, is anticipated to be a significant and important research area in itself, and we will explore alternative designs in future work.

2.2. Auditory Attention Inference System

This module calculates probability of attention given EEG evidence. It takes raw EEG measurements, (estimated) sound sources and weights to extract EEG features (evidence), as explained in Section 4. Then, using Bayes rule, the posterior probability distribution of attention over sources is expressed as the product of EEG evidence likelihood times the prior probability distribution over sources.

$$P(A_n = i|\varepsilon_n) \propto P(\varepsilon_n|A_n = i)P(A_n = i) \tag{2}$$

In our experiments, we start with a uniform prior over sources and then prior information will be updated based on the observed EEG evidence as explained in 5.2 as well.

3. Data Collection and Preprocessing

3.1. EEG Neurophysiological Data

Ten volunteers (5 male, 5 female), between the ages of 25 to 30 years, with no known history of hearing impairment or neurological problems participated in this study, which followed an IRB-approved protocol. EEG signals were recorded using a g.USBamp biosignal amplifier using active g.Butterfly electrodes with cap application from g.Tec (Graz, Austria) at 256 Hz. Sixteen EEG channels (P1, PZ, P2, CPZ, CZ, C3, C4, T7, T8, FC3, FC4, F3, F4 and FZ according to International 10/20 System) were selected to capture auditory related brain activities over the scalp. Signals were filtered by built-in analog bandpass ([0.5, 60] Hz) and notch (60Hz) filters.

3.2. Experimental Design

We conducted two sets of experiments six months apart from each other. The phase 1 experiments were designed to reveal the roles of frequency and spatial features of sound sources on brain activity, in the presence of competing sources [26]. Diotic (both

sounds playing in both ears) and dichotic (different sounds playing in each ear) stimulus presentations were conducted to isolate and study effects of respectively spatial and frequency cues of attended versus unattended speech independent of each other. Based on the results of phase 1 [26], we designed the phase 2 experiments to assess the initial version of the online attention detection system presented here.

In phase 2, each subject completed one calibration session and one online session. Calibration session was similar to diotic sessions of phase 1 except for trial length needed for decision making. Total training session time for both phase 1 and phase 2 were about 30 minutes. However, phase 2 training session consisted of 60 trials of 20 seconds simultaneous speaking of two speakers in both ears comparing to 20 trials of 60 seconds in phase 1. Participants were asked to passively listen to speech stimuli sessions through earphones. Speech stimuli were selected from audio books of literary novels. One male and one female speaker narrated their stories simultaneously in each trial for all sessions. Subjects were directed to attend male/female speakers using (f/m) signs on screen. We designed phase 2 of experiments using diotic stimulus presentation, which assumes we do not have any spatial information on sources and unmasking by the brain is just based on frequency differences. The online session consists of 10 two-minute long sequences, each sequence containing 6 twenty-second trials. Before each sequence, subjects were asked to attend to one of the speakers using an image trial. In each sequence, weights were updated 6 times after every trial (i.e, twenty seconds apart in the beginning of each trial), preceded by a 0.5 second pause. Amplitude of speech stimulus signal was scaled to yield equal energy for the equal weight case. Silent portions of data longer than 0.2 second were truncated to be 0.2 second long, in order to reduce distraction of subjects.



Figure 2. Experimental paradigm visualization. The subjects attended for to each speaker for 30 trials each, as illustrated in 2.a and 2.b

3.3. Data Pre-processing

EEG brain activity measurements were digitally filtered by a linear-phase bandpass filter ($[1.5, 42]$Hz). For each trial, t_x sec of EEG signal time-locked to the onset of each stimulus was extracted resulting in N samples. The acoustic envelope of speech stimulus signals were calculated using the Hilbert transform and filtered by a low pass filter (with 20Hz cut-off frequency). Then, t_x seconds of acoustic envelope signals following every

stimulus and time locked to the stimulus onset were extracted. Optimizing t_x to get good performance with minimum time window is an important factor in the design of online auditory BCI systems. In this paper, we selected $t_x = 20$, based on the results of phase I which is reported in [26]. The data length was selected based on the analysis we performed over the calibration data such that the length is chosen to optimize area under the receiver operating characteristics curve (AUC) of the intent inference engine with a constraint on the upper bound of the data length. More specifically, we analyzed the AUC as a function of the data length, and we chose the data length value when the changes in the AUC as the data length increases became more incremental for most of the participants.

4. Methods

4.1. Feature Extraction

Top down attention to an external sound source differentially modulates the neural activity to track the envelope of that sound source at different time lags [16], [17], [18]. Therefore, as discriminative features, we calculate the cross correlation (CC) between the extracted EEG measurements and target and distractor acoustic envelopes at different time lags. $\boldsymbol{\tau_n} = [\tau_1, \cdots, \tau_l, \cdots, \tau_L]^\intercal$ is the vector of discreet time lag delays in sample between EEG and acoustic envelop of played sounds. In our analysis, we consider $\tau \in [t_1, t_2] \times f_s$, with t_1 and t_2 as sampling times chosen as described below. For each channel, we calculate cross correlations between EEG and the male and female speakers' acoustic envelopes for the time lag sample values defined in $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Assuming that $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is a $L \times 1$ vector, we concatenate the cross correlation values from male and female speakers into a single vector and hence each feature vector is $2L \times 1$ dimensional. As described in Section 3.3, N is number of EEG data and sound source samples used for CC calculation. We have examined effect of reducing N on classification results in section 5.1.2.

Therefore, considering the defined notations, we calculate correlation coefficient between EEG and sound sources at different time lag samples τ_l, denoted by $\rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_l]$:

$$\rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_l] = \frac{r_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_l]}{\sigma_{e^{ch}}, \sigma_{\hat{s}^i}} \tag{3}$$

In (3), e^{ch} is EEG data recorded from channel ch, $\hat{s}^i$ is the envelope of i^{th} estimated sound channel, τ_l is a time lag sample. $r_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_l] = E[e^{ch}_{n+\tau_l:N}, \hat{s}^i_{n:N-\tau_l}]$ is the sample average between e^{ch} and $\hat{s}^i$. Therefore, $\rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_l]$ is a scalar representing correlation coefficient between EEG in channel ch and i^{th} sound channel in time lag sample τ_l. So, $\rho_{\mathbf{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}} = (\rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_1], \rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_2], ..., \rho_{e^{ch},\hat{s}^i}[\tau_L])$ is $1 \times L$ dimensional vector for L lags in τ range for channel ch and i^{th} sound channel. Feature vector will be formed by concatenation of correlation vectors for all $\hat{s}^i$'s. In our experiments which we have two sound sources this feature vector is specifically defined as $x^{ch} = [\rho_{\mathbf{e^{ch},\hat{s}^1}}, \rho_{\mathbf{e^{ch},\hat{s}^2}}]^\intercal$ which is $2L \times 1$ vector for each channel and $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, ..., x^{ch}, ..., x^{16})^\intercal$ is a $2L \times 16$ dimensional

matrix which contains features for each trial.

4.2. Classification and Dimension Reduction

As explained in Section 3, the participants were asked to direct their auditory attention to a target speaker during data collection. The other speaker is the distractor. The labeled data collected in this manner is used in the analysis of discrimination between two speakers in a binary auditory attention classification problem. As explained in Section 4.1, for each trial we have $\mathbf{x}$ as the collection of $2L \times 1$ dimensional cross-correlation features for each channel. For analysis of data using all channels, we apply PCA first for dimensionality reduction to remove zero variance directions. Afterwards, feature vectors for each channel will be concatenated to form a single aggregated feature vector for further analysis. Then, we use Regularized Discriminant Analysis (RDA) [27] as the classifier in our analysis. RDA is a modification of Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA). QDA assumes that data is generated by two Gaussian distributions with unknown mean and covariances and requires the estimation of these means and covariances of the target and nontarget classes before the calculation of the likelihood ratio. However, since, L, the length of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, as defined in Section 4.1, is usually large resulting in feature vectors with large dimensions even after the application of PCA, and the calibration sessions are short, the covariance estimates are rank deficient.

RDA eliminates the singularity of covariance matrices by introducing shrinkage and regularization steps. Assume each $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a $p \times 1$-dimensional feature vector for each trial and y_i is its binary label showing if the feature belongs to speaker 1 or 2, that is $y_i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the maximum likelihood estimates of the class conditional mean and the covariance matrices are computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k &= \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{x}_i \delta(y_i, k) \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k &= \frac{1}{N_K} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)(\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^T \delta(y_i, k) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Kronecker-δ function, k represent a possible class label (here $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and N_k is the number of realizations in class k. Accordingly, the shrinkage and regularization of RDA is applied respectively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k(\lambda) &= \frac{(1-\lambda) N_k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k + (\lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{1} N_k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k}{(1-\lambda) N_k + (\lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{1} N_k} \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k(\lambda, \gamma) &= (1-\gamma) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k(\lambda) + (\gamma) \frac{1}{p} tr[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k(\lambda)] \mathbf{I}_p \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here, $\lambda, \gamma \in [0, 1]$ are the shrinkage and regularization parameters, $tr[\cdot]$ is the trace operator and $\mathbf{I}_p$ is an identity matrix of size $p \times p$. In our system we optimize the values

of λ and γ to obtain the maximum area under the receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve (AUC) in a 5-fold cross validation framework. Finally, the RDA score for a trial with the EEG evidence vector $\mathbf{x}_i$, which is defined as:

$$s_{\mathrm{RDA}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \log\left(\frac{f_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2(\lambda,\gamma))}{f_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1(\lambda,\gamma))}\right) \tag{6}$$

where $f_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the Gaussian probability density function with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Here s values are used to plot the ROC curves and to compute the AUC values. RDA can be considered as a nonlinear projection which maps EEG evidence to one dimensional score $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = s_{\mathrm{RDA}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Finally, the conditional probability density function of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ given the class label, i.e. $p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \epsilon | A = i)$ needs to be estimated. We use kernel density estimation on the training data using a Gaussian kernel as

$$\hat{p}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \epsilon | A = i) = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{A(v)=i} K_{h_i}(\epsilon - \epsilon(v)), \tag{7}$$

where $\epsilon(v)$ is the discriminant score corresponding to a sample v in the training data, that is to be calculated during cross validation, and $K_{h_k}(.)$ is the kernel function with bandwidth h_k. For a Gaussian kernel, the bandwidth h_k is estimated using Silverman's rule of thumb ($\hat{h}_k = (\frac{4\hat{\sigma}^5}{3n})^{1/5} \cong 1.06\hat{\sigma}n^{-1/5}$) for each class k [28]. This assumes the underlying density has the same average curvature as its variance-matching normal distribution [29].

5. Analysis and Results

As illustrated in phase 1, our previous work, [26], features formed using the CC coefficient series $\rho_{\mathbf{e^{ch}},\hat{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{1}}, \rho_{\mathbf{e^{ch}},\hat{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{2}}$ as calculated in (3) show distinct patterns for attended vs unattended sound sources and these patterns are observed to be consistent across participants. For diotic presentation, the highest distinguishable absolute correlation between the sound sources and EEG is identified in the range of [0,400] ms. We accordingly extract features within this range of correlation delay, τ. In this range, we observe a negative correlation for both target and distractor speakers followed by an early positive correlation for the target stimulus and delayed and suppressed version of that positive correlation for the distractor stimulus. These results are quantitatively summarized in Table 1, more specifically this table reports the average temporal latency and the magnitude of the peak in cross correlation responses across all participants.

In the rest of the analysis, we consider the correlation delay τ to be in the range of [0,400]ms to form the feature vectors.

Correlation Features	**Positive Peak Magnitude Ratio**	**Time Lag of Peak (ms)**	
Stimulus	Target / Distractor	Target	Distractor
Average for all Participants (mean ± sd)	2.08 ± 1.1	159.34 ± 11	225.78 ± 42.9

Table 1. Average of time latency and magnitude of peak in cross correlation responses across all participants.

5.1. Offline Data Analysis

5.1.1. ***Single channel classification analysis*** Using the selected window of [0,400] ms as the most informative window for classification of target versus distractor responses, we first form the vector x^{ch} as shown on 4.1, we then use these features for each EEG channel independently to localize the selective attention responses using the classification scheme described in Section 4.2. As the result of phase I, our previous work, suggested, we relocated electrodes for phase II to be more centered around frontal cortex, see Section 3.1. Figure 3 shows the topographical map of classification performance in terms of area under the receiver operating characteristics curve (AUC) over the scalp, for all participants. Moreover, for each participant best channel AUC values are reported in Table 2. The Figure and Table show that the classification accuracy varies across participants, but for each participant channels located in central and frontal cortices have higher classification accuracy.



Figure 3. Topographic map of classification performance over the scalp for classifying attended versus unattended speakers for all participants.

Participant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Best AUC	0.92	0.92	1	0.84	0.83	0.92	0.80	0.91	0.96	0.89
Best channel	Fz	C3	C4	Fc3	F4	T7	C3	C4	CPz	C3

Table 2. channel with maximum performance and its corresponding AUC performance.

5.1.2. ***Classification performance versus trial length analysis*** In this section we analyze the effect of trial length on classification performance. Specifically, using the calibration data, we consider different lengths (from 2 seconds to 20 seconds) of EEG and estimated sound sources to calculate the cross correlations and extract features

accordingly to train our classifier to distinguish the attended sound source from the unattended one. Figure 4 shows the classification performance using all 16 channels. In this figure, different colors represent the performances of different subjects. Blue curve is the average of performance over all 10 subjects using different data lengths for classification. Dark and light shaded areas around the average line shows the 50 and 95 percent confidence interval calculated according to the bootstrap method, respectively. Figure 4(a) shows AUC performance while Figure 4(b) shows probability of correct decision (i.e., accuracy). Moreover, Figure 4(b) also compares our results with a related previous work that is presented in [23]. The performance reported for 128 channels in that previous work is illustrated as a green line in this figure. In this figure, we observe that using much smaller number of channels, our method outperforms the previous approach.



Figure 4. Performance versus trial length curves considering (a) AUC and (b) Accuracy as performance metrics. Different colored dots are used to represent the performance of different subjects. Blue curve is the average of performance values over all 10 subjects. Green line presents the performance results of a previous approach.

5.2. Online Controller Performance

Recall that as explained in Section 3.2, the online experiment includes listening to 10 two-minute sequences and within each sequence we perform adaptive sound source weight estimation and update for every 20 seconds that is one trial. More specifically, we calculate the EEG evidence as explained in Section 4.1. Using conditional probability density functions as described in section 4.2, we obtain the posterior estimate of the probability for each class being the intended source, which is proportional to class conditional likelihoods times prior knowledge on probability of attention. Then source weights for each source are adjusted as being proportional to the posterior probability of that class given EEG evidence.

$$w_{k,n+1}^{(i)} = p(A_k = i|\varepsilon_{k,n}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k,1}) \tag{8}$$

$$= \frac{p(A_k = i|\varepsilon_{k,n})p(A_k = i|\varepsilon_{k,n-1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k,1})}{\sum_{j=1}^{2} p(A_k = j|\varepsilon_{k,n})p(A_k = j|\varepsilon_{k,n-1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k,1})} \quad , i = 1, 2 \tag{9}$$

$$= \frac{p(A_k = i|\varepsilon_{k,n}) \cdot w_{k,n}^{(i)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2} p(A_k = j|\varepsilon_{k,n}) \cdot w_{k,n}^{(j)}} \quad , i = 1, 2 \tag{10}$$

In the equation above, k is the sequence index and n is the trial index. Each sequence contains 6 trials and during each sequence we assume that the user is focusing on the same sounds source. This equation assumes that the attention remains on the same source during the updates in each sequence. Also in this weight update equation above we initialize $p(A_k = i|\varepsilon_{k,0}) = 0.5$. We trained the system using a calibration session and tested the learned model in an online session. Users attempted to amplify the designated target speech with their auditory attention using this brain interface in 10, two-minute-long trials. Figure 5 shows the average of decided weights (at every 20 seconds over 5 trials) for attended and unattended speech sources over the course of two minutes, for male and female narrators. Figure 5 (a) is the average of probabilities for each class using its proceding 20 seconds of data at every time instant along the horizontal axis. Figure 5 (b) shows the average of employed weights instead of normalized probalities. And the difference comes from the limits imposed on weights ([0.25 to 0.75] which are shown with green constants). These limitations were imposed to ensure the audibility of both sources to enable mistake correction in the event of algorithm/human errors, and to allow shifting attention if desired.



Figure 5. Weight change in each trial at every 20 second which is averaged over trials and subjects for female and male target separately.

5.3. Online Vs Offline data analysis

Since changes in energy and amplitude of competing sound sources will potentially change the statistics of the EEG measurements, analyzing how robust feature vectors are to these changes can help us understand impacts of weights of sound sources on attention and EEG models. Table 3 shows the results of testing the classification method on offline data and online data independent of each other using 5-fold cross validation within each dataset. AUC results obtained when the EEG classifier trained using offline data (weights fixed to 0.5) on the online data (weights changing) are also provided. The reduction of AUC from 5-fold cross validation on offline calibration data (row 1) to application of calibrated classifier on online data (row 3) shows that we need to consider variable amplitudes during calibration. The fact that 5-fold cross validation on online session data (row 2) also yields lower AUC, then offline data analysis is consistent with this conclusion.

Participant / AUC	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Calibration Data (offline)	0.91	0.89	1	0.81	0.88	0.82	0.77	0.89	0.94	0.83
Online Session Data	0.83	0.74	0.98	0.63	0.82	0.8	0.74	0.92	0.83	0.69
Calibration Model on Online Data	0.86	0.77	0.95	0.73	0.77	0.83	0.8	0.82	0.86	0.70

Table 3. AUCs for offline and online data independently and applying the learned model from offline data on online data.

6. Conclusion, Limitations and future work

This work is a preliminary attempt to investigate the feasibility of online classification of auditory attention using a non-invasive EEG-based brain interface. In a multi-speaker scenario, the brain interface presented in this manuscript utilizes an automatic gain control to adjust the amplitudes of attended and unattended sound sources with the goal of increasing signal-noise-ratio and improving listening and hearing comfort. Through an experimental study, we showed that the designed BCI together with the automatic gain control has the potential to improve the information rate by reducing the trial lengths and increasing the classification accuracies for shorter trial lengths compared to the performance results reported in the existing related work. Even though promising results were obtained with this proof of concept study, there are many opportunities to improve the performance of the system. For example, various different techniques could be investigated to optimize the automatic gain control scheme or the classification method with the purpose of enabling fast and accurate decision making in an online setting. This improvement is essential for the presented BCI to be a practical reality and potentially be a part of the future generations of hearing aids.

References

[1] S. Kochkin, "Marketrak viii: 25-year trends in the hearing health market," *Hearing Review*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 12–31, 2009.

[2] S. A. Gelfand, *Hearing: An introduction to psychological and physiological acoustics*. CRC Press, 2016.

[3] K. Chung, "Challenges and recent developments in hearing aids part i. speech understanding in noise, microphone technologies and noise reduction algorithms," *Trends in Amplification*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 83–124, 2004.

[4] W. A. Yost, "The cocktail party problem: Forty years later," *Binaural and spatial hearing in real and virtual environments*, pp. 329–347, 1997.

[5] W. A. Yost and S. Sheft, "Auditory perception," in *Human psychophysics*. Springer, 1993, pp. 193–236.

[6] A. S. Bregman, *Auditory scene analysis: The perceptual organization of sound*. MIT press, 1994.

[7] E. C. Cherry, "Some experiments on the recognition of speech, with one and with two ears," *The Journal of the acoustical society of America*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 975–979, 1953.

[8] M. Ungstrup, P. Kidmose, and M. L. Rank, "Hearing aid with self fitting capabilities," Jan. 29 2014, uS Patent App. 14/167,256.

[9] G. Kidd Jr, S. Favrot, J. G. Desloge, T. M. Streeter, and C. R. Mason, "Design and preliminary testing of a visually guided hearing aid," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 133, no. 3, pp. EL202–EL207, 2013.

[10] M. Schreuder, T. Rost, and M. Tangermann, "Listen, you are writing! speeding up online spelling with a dynamic auditory bci," *Frontiers in neuroscience*, vol. 5, 2011.

[11] J. Höhne, M. Schreuder, B. Blankertz, and M. Tangermann, "A novel 9-class auditory erp paradigm driving a predictive text entry system," *Frontiers in neuroscience*, vol. 5, 2011.

[12] A. Kübler, A. Furdea, S. Halder, E. M. Hammer, F. Nijboer, and B. Kotchoubey, "A brain–computer interface controlled auditory event-related potential (p300) spelling system for locked-in patients," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 1157, no. 1, pp. 90–100, 2009.

[13] S. Halder, M. Rea, R. Andreoni, F. Nijboer, E. Hammer, S. Kleih, N. Birbaumer, and A. Kübler, "An auditory oddball brain–computer interface for binary choices," *Clinical Neurophysiology*, vol. 121, no. 4, pp. 516–523, 2010.

[14] A. Furdea, S. Halder, D. Krusienski, D. Bross, F. Nijboer, N. Birbaumer, and A. Kübler, "An auditory oddball (p300) spelling system for brain-computer interfaces," *Psychophysiology*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 617–625, 2009.

[15] S. Kanoh, K.-i. Miyamoto, and T. Yoshinobu, "A brain-computer interface (bci) system based on auditory stream segregation," in *Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 2008. EMBS 2008. 30th Annual International Conference of the IEEE*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 642–645.

[16] N. Ding and J. Z. Simon, "Cortical entrainment to continuous speech: functional roles and interpretations," *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, vol. 8, 2014.

[17] S. J. Aiken and T. W. Picton, "Human cortical responses to the speech envelope," *Ear and hearing*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 139–157, 2008.

[18] Y.-Y. Kong, A. Mullangi, and N. Ding, "Differential modulation of auditory responses to attended and unattended speech in different listening conditions," *Hearing research*, vol. 316, pp. 73–81, 2014.

[19] A. J. Power, E. C. Lalor, and R. B. Reilly, "Endogenous auditory spatial attention modulates obligatory sensory activity in auditory cortex," *Cerebral Cortex*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1223–1230, 2011.

[20] C. M. Sheedy, A. J. Power, R. B. Reilly, M. J. Crosse, G. M. Loughnane, and E. C. Lalor, "Endogenous auditory frequency-based attention modulates electroencephalogram-based measures of obligatory sensory activity in humans," *NeuroReport*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 219–225, 2014.

[21] J. A. O'Sullivan, A. J. Power, N. Mesgarani, S. Rajaram, J. J. Foxe, B. G. Shinn-Cunningham, M. Slaney, S. A. Shamma, and E. C. Lalor, "Attentional selection in a cocktail party environment can be decoded from single-trial eeg," *Cerebral Cortex*, p. bht355, 2014.

[22] B. Mirkovic, S. Debener, M. Jaeger, and M. De Vos, "Decoding the attended speech stream with

multi-channel eeg: implications for online, daily-life applications," *Journal of neural engineering*, vol. 12, no. 4, p. 046007, 2015.

[23] C. Horton, R. Srinivasan, and M. DZmura, "Envelope responses in single-trial eeg indicate attended speaker in a cocktail party," *Journal of neural engineering*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 046015, 2014.

[24] B. N. Pasley, S. V. David, N. Mesgarani, A. Flinker, S. A. Shamma, N. E. Crone, R. T. Knight, and E. F. Chang, "Reconstructing speech from human auditory cortex," *PLoS Biol*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. e1001251, 2012.

[25] M. Slaney, "Pay attention, please: Attention at the telluride neuromorphic cognition workshop," *IEEE SLTC Newsletter*, 2012.

[26] M. Haghighi, M. Moghadamfalahi, H. Nezamfar, M. Akcakaya, and D. Erdogmus, "Toward a brain interface for tracking attended auditory sources," in *2016 IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.

[27] J. H. Friedman, "Regularized discriminant analysis," *Journal of the American statistical association*, vol. 84, no. 405, pp. 165–175, 1989.

[28] B. W. Silverman, *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*. CRC press, 1986, vol. 26.

[29] U. Orhan, D. Erdogmus, B. Roark, B. Oken, and M. Fried-Oken, "Offline analysis of context contribution to erp-based typing bci performance," *Journal of neural engineering*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. 066003, 2013.